



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/617,180

07/11/2003

Kwang-Rae Cho

P68982US0

2989

7590

06/07/2004

JACOBSON, PRICE, HOLMAN & STERN
PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2816

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/617,180

Applicant(s)

CHO, KWANG-RAE

Examiner

Minh Nguyen

Art Unit

2816

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/11/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it uses language which can be implied, i.e., "The present invention", "comprises". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 2, 4-5 and 10-11 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 2, line 4, "the clock buffer" should be changed to -- the clock buffer means --, for consistency, see line 2 of claim 1.

In claim 4, lines 15-16, "to both the power voltage" should be changed to -- to a power voltage --.

In claim 5, line 4, "power-up signal" should be changed to -- the power-up signal --, see line 9 of claim 1.

In claim 10, line 5, "transistor1" should be changed to -- transistor --.

In claim 11, line 13, "the NMOS transistor" should be changed to -- the second NMOS transistor --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 1, the recitation the clock enable buffer means for enabling the block buffer means on line 6 is misdescriptive because as shown in Fig. 4 of the present invention, the signal (D_out) from the clock enable buffer means (100) is not for enabling the clock buffer means (2000) as recited, but rather, it is used as one of the input signals to the clock enable signal timing controller (300) for generating the clock enable signal (OUT) to enable the clock buffer means (2000). Since it is clear that the signal (OUT) is different from the signal (D_out), the recitation the clock enable buffer means is for enabling the block buffer means on line 6 is misdescriptive. The applicant should be aware that in a means plus function recitation, the function of a circuit should be the same as the one described in the specification. In the instant case, the specification describes the clock enable buffer means providing the (D_out) signal to the clock enable signal timing controller (300), not for enabling the clock buffer means (2000),

Art Unit: 2816

therefore, the recitation is misdescriptive because it is not consistent with the function of the clock enable buffer means (100) described in the specification. The claim is further rejected as being indefinite because it fails to particularly point out the structural relationships between the clock buffer means, the clock enable buffer means and the clock enable signal latch means, i.e., the claim provides no structural relationship between these elements so that the clock buffer means is able to be enabled by the clock enable buffer means as recited or the clock enable signal latch means is able to enable the clock enable buffer means as recited.

As per claim 2, the term “clock enable signal” recited on line 4 lacks antecedent basis. The term “enable signal” recited on line 5 lacks antecedent basis. These problems exist because claim 1 does not have a clear structural relationship between one element to the others.

As per claim 3, the term “enable signal” recited on line 5 lacks clear antecedent basis, i.e., it is unclear if the term is related to the term “enable signal” recited on line 5 of claim 2. The problem is a further evidence to show^u the lacking of the structural relationship between elements noted in claim 1.

As per claim 6, the term “the first control signal” recited on line 4 lacks clear antecedent basis, i.e., it is unclear if it is referring to the clock enable signal recited on line 4 of claim 2. If it is the same signal, the same name should be used to avoid antecedent basis problem.

As per claims 2-11, these claims are further rejected because of the indefiniteness of their parent claims and/or because of the problems of the terms discussed in claims 2-3 and 6.

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 2816

4. Claims 1-11 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Claims 1-11 are allowable because the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest the inclusion of a clock enable signal latch means (200) for generating and providing an enable signal (CLE_ON) to the clock enable buffer means (100) using the clock enable buffer signal (CKE) after a power-up signal (pwrap) is provided to the clock enable signal latch means as recited in claim 1.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1748. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Callahan can be reached on 571-272-1740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



5/28/04

Minh Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2816